

## **REMARKS**

**[0004]** Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 CFR. § 1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

**[0005]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-28 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, and 27. No claims are added, withdrawn, or cancelled herein.

### **Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0006]** If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

**[0007]** Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

## **Claim Amendments**

**[0008]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, and 27 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under § 103**

[0009] The Examiner rejects claims 1-28 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0010] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0011] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Alexander:** *Alexander, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,177,931 (issued January 23, 2001); and
- **Lemmons:** *Lemmons, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,266,814 (issued July 24, 2001).

## **Obviousness Rejections**

### **Based upon Alexander and Lemmons**

[0012] The Examiner rejects claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander and Lemmons. While disagreeing with the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended the claims to further prosecution and better distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited references.

### **Independent Claim 1**

[0013] Applicant submits that combined references do not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

"in response to one or more triggering user interactions, presenting **a quick EPG-navigation UI that is inlaid within the grid pattern of the schedule of multimedia programming**, the EPG-navigation UI having one or more user-selectable options therein, **wherein the inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI is presented so that the inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI is logically inlaid between time blocks of the schedule of multimedia programming in the grid pattern**, the schedule of multimedia programming and inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI both being presented simultaneously"

[0014] In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites Figure 8 of Lemmons as showing a quick EPG-navigation UI that is inlaid within an EPG UI. Figure 8 illustrates a number of "time-to-view" time slots for a given day shown alongside

a calendar of days. Even assuming for the sake of argument that one of the time slots and calendar teaches or suggests a “quick EPG-navigation UI” that is inlaid in an EPG UI (a point which Applicant does not concede), nothing in Lemmons or Alexander teaches or describes “a quick EPG-navigation UI that is inlaid ***within the grid pattern of the schedule of multimedia programming.***” Figure 8 of Lemmons does not show a schedule of multimedia programming, much less a quick EPG-navigation UI that is inlaid within *the grid pattern* of such a schedule.

[0015] Further, now amended claim 1 also recited that “the inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI is ***logically inlaid between time blocks of the schedule of multimedia programming in the grid pattern.***” Because the combined references do not teach or suggest a quick EPG-navigation UI that is inlaid in a grid pattern of a schedule of multimedia programming, it follows that they also fail to teach that such a UI is *logically inlaid between time blocks* of a schedule of multimedia programming.

[0016] As shown above, the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 13, 17, 21, and 25

**[0017]** These claims include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 13, 17, 21, and 25 are patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 2-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, and 26-28

**[0018]** These claims ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25. As discussed above, claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

## **Conclusion**

[0019] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/  
Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; x5005)

Dated: May 19, 2009

Registration No. 53725

Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)

Registration No. 56826

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)